

- 14 -

TORMASOV *et al.*
Appl. No. 10/005,590

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1 - 8, 10 - 27, 29 - 35 and 37 - 45 are pending in the application, with 1, 7, 14, 20, 30, 39 and 45 being the independent claims. Claims 9, 28 and 36 were previously canceled. Claims 1, 7, 14, 20, 30, 39 and 45 are amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action dated November 18, 2005, claims 1 - 8, 10 - 27, 29 - 35 and 37 - 45 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Cheng *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,823,462 in view of Huang *et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0091697. Claims 1 - 8, 10 - 27, 29 - 35 and 37 - 45 and 10-45 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoke *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,701,437 in view of Huang *et al.*

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Interview at the USPTO

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview at the USPTO on December 5, 2005. Applicants appreciate the considerable time and effort that the Examiner has devoted to this application, and the fact that the Examiner has granted the third in-person interview in this matter.

During the interview, the differences between Virtual Private Networks (VPNs) and Virtual Environments (VEs) were discussed. Also, the aspects of memory allocation and in

Atty. Dkt. No. 2230.0380001

- 15 -

TORMASOV *et al.*
Appl. No. 10/005,590

particular, dedication of memory (or not dedication, in the case of the independent claims), and the nature of the virtual environments were discussed.

The Examiner has suggested that the claims be amended to better clarify and define what the Applicants consider to be the claimed Virtual Environment. Applicants have therefore amended the independent claims to reflect the following:

- (1) That the claimed memory at issue is a random access memory (to make it clear what is meant by "physical memory" recited previously);
- (2) That multiple virtual environments can share the same operating system (see, e.g., paragraphs [1025]-[1026] and FIG. 2 of the specification); and
- (3) That the virtual environments run service processes (see, e.g., FIGS. 2-4).

Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments distinguish the present claims over any VPN-based art (such as Hoke and Cheng), and place the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of this application.

For the record, and as discussed at some length during the interview, it remains Applicants' position that VPN art is irrelevant to the claimed virtual environments. In the interest of full disclosure, Applicants also would like to bring to the Examiner's attention that on the same day as the interview in this case, Applicants also conducted an in-person interview with Examiner Adnan Mirza relating to pending Application No. 09/918,031. In that application, a Virtual Server Farm reference (Aziz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,779,016) in combination with Huang et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0091697 (the same Huang et al. reference) was

Atty. Dkt. No. 2230.0380001

- 16 -

TORMASOV *et al.*
Appl. No. 10/005,590

used to reject claims directed to other aspects of virtual environments. It is Applicants' view that the Virtual Server Farms are no more relevant to the claimed virtual environments than are VPNs.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BARDMESSER LAW GROUP

George S. Bardmesser
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,020

Date: December 6, 2005

910 17th Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-1191

Atty. Dkt. No. 2230.0380001